P. 13-98

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1890-91.

192.

(LR)

Later references.

File No. 71-90

Serial Nos. 1-29

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1- 29.

In ~~Part~~ B for March 1899.

SUBJECT.

Dispute regarding the Patel of Harohalli Village, Kankanhalli Taluk ——.

WD 2233-GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Indexed

Amaldar's Report of

11th January 1878

After the death of Gurusid-
-ya's father, the Asst. Coll.
of Closepet Sub-Division
issued an order that the
person for holding the vacant
appointment of Patelship
should be selected. And it
is reported to [redacted]
that Gooru siddaya Dandu
person in whose name the
appointment was to be
registered. On reply he
received [redacted]. Gooru siddaya
is very indifferent to his
duties as Patel. [redacted] the said
that his brothers [redacted]
would not permit him to attend
to his duties of Patel and
resigned the appointment.
His Kulkarni as well as his

resignation for the appointment
are herewith submitted. Even
if the appointment of patel is
forced on Goorusiddaiya
it is certain that he will not perform
the duties of the appointment.

Therefore I beg that —

Vadera Basavaiya may be
entered in the register & that work
~~entered as the~~
may be taken from him.
~~Register holder of the~~

appointment ~~as hereditary~~
~~office~~ ~~pararakaru~~. In fact
for the last 9 months Vadera
Basavaiya has been doing
the duties of patel and I beg
that early orders may be passed
~~that I may hereafter be~~
~~asked to do the work of the Register~~
~~holder of the appointment~~

— — —

Reply.

Your proposal has
been approved and you shd
act according to rules (Sd) [illegible]
~~may do accordingly~~

15-2-78

Ans R. Reply —
As ordered. his name is registered & Patel
issued 6. 5. 78

Precis relating to the complaint of Basaviah late Potail of Barohully, Kankanhulli Talug, Bangalore Distt

---

Petitioner Basaviah (1) did not pay the arrears of Candayem due by him and a notice was issued (2) to him. He having had no other property his Lands Nos 299-300 and 548 were attached and sold, as none purchased them a report was sent by the amildar to the Dy Comr, who issued an order to the effect that if the amount ~~cannot~~ could not be recovered the lands ~~might~~ might be resumed ~~be taken up~~ by Government and a re-mission statement ~~sent~~ submitted. The lands are resumed in Swabhavana

Petitioner as Potail was also in charge of the Cattle pound. On the receipt of several complaints against

(1). Rs: 19-11-3 for 1880-81.
Rs: 60-12-0 " 1881-82
1-0-0 . notice fee
Total 81-7-3.

(2). Dated 13.10.82.

No: 3348/29-7-83

No: 2968/16-8-83

against the petitioner to the effect that he was not performing the duties relating to the battle ground, that he used to keep the money collected in the ground with him for 4 or 6 months, that he would only remit the said money to the Taluq Treasury whenever there was a complaint, that he possessed no property and that he was not trustworthy the amildar made enquiries and submitted an urzee to the Sub Division Officer Bloxepett. ~~A letter~~ Order to the amildar stating that the petitioner had not paid the arrears of condayem due by him, that there was no means of recovering it from him and that a report ~~will~~ would be sent to the Deputy Commissioner for his removal from the potailship he being a pauper and could not be trusted. The matter was reported to the Deputy Commissioner during Jamabundy, who passed

(1) reporting that the Patel was not a trustworthy man, that he had not been doing work properly, that he was a man of no means, & that orders might be given for selecting another man.

The Amildar was directed to submit a Complete report.

Rev: 207 of 13-5-85

Rev: 33 of 3-1-86

Note. This order was given in the Course of the Correspondence relating to the Patel's application for the grant of Sur: No 5 (wet) on account of Patel Inam vested in the Govt Nos: 312, 315, 316, 484, & 485. (vide their reports No: 112 of 10.6.85 No: 258 of 7.6.85)

5

No: 431 d/ 5th Feby 1886. passed an order to the effect that the potail should be allowed 6 months time and after that period a report shld be submitted as to his cha= =racter and as to how he ~~does~~ did his work

No: 518 d/ 3-3-86 The annildar accordingly submitted a report to the Dy Comm= stating that the petitioner ~~had~~ has not paid the arrears of Kandayam Rs ~~1-6-0~~ 139-2-0 due by him, that he ~~has~~ had no property, and that the ~~Shanbogue had~~ ~~omitted to bring these receipts~~ ~~enter this arrear in the Bakipatti as due~~ ~~in the Patta~~ ~~as in the Patta~~.

x arrears should be entered in the remission list.

The petitioner however deposed that such a large sum was not due by him but only Rs 3 0 0, & that he x had paid the rest of the arrears to the Shanbhog & that he took no receipt from the latter.

No: 465 d/ 9-3-86 The Dy Comm= sent an order to the annildar stating that as petitioner denies that he owes such a large amount, further enquiry should be made. The annildar ac= =cordingly made further enquiries and submitted the papers to the Dy Comm= who referred the same to

No: 6 d/ 4-4-86 the

the Sub Divn Officer for disposal.

The Sub Divn Officer finding the statement of the petitioner to be false sent an order to the amildar directing him to submit his opinion as to the removal of the petitioner and as to the appointment of another to the office of potail - The amildar in reply stated that the petitioner was a pauper, that he should be removed and that he would select a competent man for filling up the office of potail at the time of the janabundy.

No: 138 of 22-4-86

No: 173 of 30-8-86

Thereupon the sub Divn officer sent a yadi to the Divn stating that the period of 6 months allowed to the potail had expired, that he had not paid the large amount of arrears due by him, and that he was a pauper and requesting sanction for removing the petitioner and appointing another in his stead as potail -

No: 218 of 7-10-86

x M. Abdul Rahman

The

No: 2250/20-10-86

× Col: Macintire -

Order No: 230
of 21.10.86.

-※ The Petn produced his daughters son Srikanta - who was found unfit by the Asst -
The Asst - also reported that Petn was more than 60 years of age & that another Patel was required {No: 133 of 29-7-87 / No: 189 of 5-9-87

No: 130 of 7-9-87

The Dy Comr sent a reply asking the Sub Divn officer to direct the amildar to appoint petitioners son, as potail, if he was fit or else to appoint any other person connected with the petitioner's family as potails Gumastha.

The Sub Divn officer directed ~~intimated~~ the amildar to submit a report as to the competency of the petitioners son or any other person connected with the petitioner's family

The petitioner not having brought any of his relatives ※ though directed to do so the amildar reported the same. Thereupon the Dy Comr issued an order directing the amildar to issue a notice to the petitr allowing him a sufficient time

~~any of his candidates for the office of Patel, to appoint persons to perform the duties of Patel.~~

Gumasta or to do the work himself properly.

Although a notice was issued to the Patel in accordance with the terms contained in the order of the by borne the Patel failed to produce a proper person.

× with 3 months' time.

The amildar reported the matter to the Sub-Divn officer, who issued an order directing the amildar to appoint a Gumastha (Govt) to the office of Patel as per order of the by borne

No: 269 of 3-2-89

No: 81 of 20-6-89

The amildar ~~reported~~ ~~on~~ ~~the~~ ~~matter~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~Asst~~ ~~Commr~~ ~~Sub-Divn~~ ~~Officer~~ ~~for~~ ~~orders~~ ~~to~~ ~~appoint~~ ~~a~~ ~~person~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~office~~ ~~of~~ ~~Patel~~.

× passed an order that able sandra would be the proper man for the Patel & that the matter should be brought to the notice of the Gumabandi Officer

The petitioner also presented a petition to the Divn officer ~~&~~ stating name of one Toomarisah

Petition of 30-12-90 addressed to the Dy Com, Bangalore.

formed
actually due
after examination
of accounts in his
presence J Soor-
narrenah.

No: 24 of 14/2/91

Note -

A list of arrears due by Petn^r & their persons was submitted to the Jamabandi office for orders. Arrears as shewn below were noted against the Petn^r -

1880-81	19-1-10
81-82	61-1-7
82-83	55-15-7
83-84	3-11-0
84-85	1-6-8
85-86	13-8-10
86-87	13-8-10
87-88	4-13-3
88-89	4-3-5
Total	Rs: 176-12-11

Mamlatdars opinion - steps taken - arrears recoverable - the defaulter has neither a house nor other property (vide Mahajar) - Records subtd.

Jamabandi office 18. B.G. Krishnangar

order - The Patel has no means to pay up the arrears - Besides he is old & unfit. He is not his trustworthy as he has no means. The village is a large one - Shanbhog Mr. Narrappa who pays a Kanddayam of Rs 155/- says that if the Patelki be given

P.J.A.

Soornarrenah might be registered to the office of potail as he (Soornarrenah) was willing to pay the amount of arrears. The Sub Div^n officer directed the amildar to receive the amount from Soornarrenah, but the latter refused to pay the amount unless he was appointed as potail

The amildar sent a report to the Sub Div^n Offr stating that the petitioner has no property, that he is old and unfit for duty, that he cannot be trusted, that he has no relatives who are fit to the office of potail, that one Soornarrenah who is the Shanbogue Registrar of Thombedi and who agrees to pay the amount of arrears may be appointed and that if the appointment of Broobarrenah to the office of potail be made Shanbogue is objectionable one Aplai Obalesh resident of

~~of the same village and~~ who agrees to pay up the arrears of caudayeum may be appointed as potail. The Sub Divn officer sent a ~~yadi to the by Comr re~~ = Commendiyet Arlai Obaliah.

The by Comr sent a reply to the Sub Divn officer stating that the amildar may be directed to recover the arrears from Arlai Obaliah and to appoint him as potail. Obaliah was accordingly appointed as potail and the amount of arrears was recovered from him.

The petitioner files the present appeal against the order of the by Comr as follows.

That he owns caudayeum lands with an assessment of Rs 50, ~~about~~ ~~Rs~~ that about Rs 176-12-11 were stated to be due by him on account of caudayeum and to him he would pay the arrears. If the Dy Comr objects to have Brahmans for both the Patels the Shanbhogs. Arle Obaliya, a Pyot of the village paying Rs 100/ Kandayam, who agrees to pay the arrears says he would do the work.

~~No 508 of 4-2-91~~

No 983 of 4-3-91

Unless the Patels is thus disposed of there is no means of recovering the arrears, and they will have to be remitted. Even then if it becomes necessary to appoint another person as Patels the Dy Comr may be requested to appoint whomsoever he thinks proper. The present Patel has no proper heirs.

- Dated. 11.12.90

Upon this the Asst submitted report no 24/ 8 14.2.91 referred to above to Mr Krishnaiengar recommending Obaliya.

Mr Krishnaiengar passed the following impd order -

"I submit this to the Dy Comr for orders with my remarks on the Baki Patta passed during Jamabandi. Obaliya may be advantageously appointed Patel. As he is willing to pay up the arrears & he is in all other respects fit for the appointment. The present incumbent is old & unfit in every respect. & he has no near relations fit to take his place. 21.2.91

(Contd)

the Dy Coms. (Mr Syed Nasir-
-uddin) then passed the
following order -

" This question was pending
for a long time and I had
about to settle the matter myself
soon. I was inclined to give
the Patell Shiv L. Obaiya and
the recommendation now
made is approved. The
amount due should be
recovered from him at
once & credited to Govt."

Sd/ Dated 4/3/91.

and that for its recovery
the District authorities have
appointed one Obaliah as
potail - thereby selling Petit's Patell
hak for his arrears stated to be due.

That a few days after
the service of a notice de-
manding the payment
of the said arrears he
petitioned the by Comm &
the Sub Divn Officer stating
that one Soornaniah
agrees to pay up the arrears
of candayeru and that
he ~~may~~ might be appointed as
potail, that the said peti-
tions were referred to the
amildar, who refused to
receive the amount, &
that the amildar and
the Jamabundy officer
recommended one Arlai
Obaliah for the office of
potail and that the by
Comm unjustly sanctioned
the said appointment.

That for recovery of
arrears his hereditory
right of potali should
not have been given
away, that the petitioners
lands

lands ought to have been
sold in the first instance
and that on failure of
the recovery of the full
amount it should have
been recovered from his
other properties. If irrecoverable they ought to have been remitted.

That petitioner is
also fit to perform the
duties of potail ~~for such~~ that
~~he has also ever elected~~
if he is found to be unfit
a gumastha who will be
named by him may be
appointed ~~to attend~~ to enable the petnr
to receive maintenance
from the said gumastha

That petitioner has a
brother, nephews and grand-
sons fit to be appointed
as potail, but no notice
was taken of them by
the by bonus and the
amildar.

That the present in
cumbent Arlai Obalish
has no claims to the
potali, ~~other than that~~
~~he has paid the arrears~~
~~due~~, that he is incompetent,
that

(1) brother's name is
Nanjundaiya

that he is possessed of pro=
perty valued at Rs 200,
but has debts to the extent
of Rs 800, that he is not
popular, that all the
ryots have preferred com=
plaints against him &
that as he is able to
contract debts to the extent
of Rs 1000 and spend
hundreds of Rs when
occasion requires, he had
opportunities to be appointed
as potail.

Therefore

That the petitioner there=
fore prays that the whole
proceedings may be sent
for and that after en=
quiry the by born order
may be reversed.

RRw
16-1-92

Amin's report
no: 30 of 19.3.91.

Obliging paid his arrears
Rs: 176" 12" 11. on 19.3.91
and it was credited to
Govt.

The actual jamabandi
of this village for 87-88
was Rs 3087" 11" 9.

surv: no: 57 (wet)
et 3½ Khandis, ast:
52 1080 · was granted
by the Collector sub-ord
office to the Patel (Petn)
as service inam in lieu
of ors nos: 312, 315, 316, 484,
2485: - total ast: Rs 48/14/2

× Order no 51 of
31·5·88.

The Huildar was
directed to levy the Kamda
-yam of no: 57 ✗ from
Basvaraja (Petn) &
allow reduction in
favor Obliqn on account
of remuneration due
to him.

× (in the amount
assessed levied
from oblign)

(vide order no: 135 of
24·8·91. from the D.C. Krishnagiri.
& the Huildar Kan Kamballi).

25/2/92

Submitted to
the Council

25/2/92

Posted for Hearing
on 2nd June 1892

1/3/92

1st March 92.

25/2/92

(6)

M No 32 of 1891-92

Appt

Vasavrah

Patail of Harshalli

Ram Ramchandra Dalvi

Bangalore

represented by

Mr advocate S. Narasimhayyar

Respt

Urle Obluvya

represented by

Mr V. V Ramaswamy

Chetti

advocate

Petitioner was removed from office in March 1891, because he fell into arrears, lost all lands, & became a pauper, & the appointment was conferred on ~~one~~ Obluvah ~~a stranger~~ Respt - a stranger from whom the arrears were collected.-

Petitioner ~~states that he~~ alleges he had ~~some lands~~ - a part owned by H undivided, & that he has a ~~brother~~, nephew & grandson & that the appointment ~~stands~~ ~~should~~ have been given to a stranger. At the hearing the appt admitted that her son ~~the brother~~ & nephews live in another village & have no lands in the village. ~~Her nephews have no lands in the village.~~ But he promises to pay arrears & acquire lands, within 6 months.

assessed at Rs 500

At the hearing, the appt ~~stated~~ stated that her nephews, brother & daughters

16

Has been no lands in the village,
but promised to pay the arrears
due, & also interest at 12 per cent per annum
appointed on the sum paid by him
& acquire lands assessed at 50 Rs
within 6 months from this date.
If he fulfils these conditions within
time promised, the Dy Comr
is requested to restore him to the
office.

31/6/92

4/6

Dy Comr

Mr is referred to the Dy Comr
to whom he has been
requested to restore him to office
if he within 6 months from the
date pays up the arrears
with interest & acquires lands
assessed at 50 Rs.

4/6

1

17

Appeal petition
no 2014 dy 7-2-98

Appellant- Channaveraya
gumasta to Basavaya
Patel of Harowhalli,
Kanakanahalli Taluk,
Bangalore district.

Subject-

This is an appeal
against order no 277
dy 27-10-97 of the Dy.
Comr confirming order
no 80 dy 7-8-97 of the
Sub-division officer
closed. removing
Channaveraya from
the gumasta's place and
appointing one
Sreenivasaya in
his plaie.

Facts of the Case.

Basavaya the
Patel of the above men-
tioned village was
illiterate and became
too olds to dis-charge
the duties of his office

He therefore nominated his daughter's son bhaumaveeraya as his gumasta. The nomination of bhaumaveeraya was approved of by Govt. order no $\frac{22170}{1738}$ & 26-5-95 which was intimated to the appellant through the Dy. Comrs order no 6372 & 10-6-95 stating that bhaumaveeraya has been appointed gumasta on probation for a year on the responsibility of Basavaya.

About 5 months after the appointment of bhaumaveeraya, one hagadi seshappa of the said village complained to the Amildar that bhaumaveeraya impounded his mare and a buffalo without any real cause for doing so, that he mis-appropriated the collection of fines for his own use, that he possessed no land in the village & that he would make a living out of the collection of fines.

{10-10-95, 5-11-95, 13-12-95} Vide - (1/1 · 1/2 & 2)7

1 Bhaumaveeraya
2 Basavaya
3 Seshappa

In the enquiry held by the Amildar the marginally noted persons deposed as hereinafter ~~will~~ be mentioned.

Bhaumaveeraya deposed as follows

(4) — 8-12-95

That on 24-10-95, seventeen cattle were impounded by Dodda Vadura. That out of which 5 were liberated by Durga Gowda of Chikkasandra by paying Rs 1-4-0 on the same date. That the remaining 12 were liberated by Venkata-ramanayya by paying Rs 2-10-0. That fines collected from the 1st to the 20th Sept. were entered in the accounts. That a sum of Rs 4-4-0 was collected for 17 cattle & was credited to the Taluk Treasury. And that the Patel would generally keep the key of the Cattle-pound in his possession and also collects & keeps fines ~~also~~ with himself.

Basavaya deposed as follows — That the sum of Rs 4-4-0 entered in the patti that was submitted along with Shekdar's report no 85 dy 4-12-95, was collected by bhanna-veeraya. That the patti showed collection from the 1st to the 30th Sept.r 95 That bhanna veeraya said that he would credit the amount to the Treasury.

8-12-95 —— (5)$_7$
20

Vide — (12)$_7$ - Basavaya handed over Rs 4-4-0 to bhannaveeraya for Irsal on 12-10-95

Seshappa deposed as follows — That bhannaveeraya misappropriated a certain amount of fine collections derived from the cattle-pound without entering in the pound register the entire number of cattle that were impounded. And that on 4th Sept. bhanna veeraya collected fines for two mares + from his (Seshappa's) son aged about 16 years while he had only one mare.

9-12-95 —— (6)$_7$

Vide — Cattle-pound receipt (7)$_7$

Meanwhile the Shekdar reported that bhannaveeraya credited only one Rupee to the Treasury for Rs 4-4-0

9-12-95

2/

(13)$_7$ — 24-12-95 ∴ 21

Basavaya also reported to the Amildar that most of the villagers complained against the conduct of bhamaveeraya & that he was afraid that there might be some danger to his office of Patel by bhamaveeraya's conduct.

(16)$_7$ — 7-2-96

The ryots of the village also prepared a mahazer to the following effect — That the receipt contains one cow & one calf. But that when the cattle-pound was inspected there were 8 cattle & the receipt was found to be false.

(14)$_7$ — 20-2-96

Basavaya again complained to the Amildar that he might exclusively be permitted to look after the duties of his office as the conduct of bhamaveeraya was very unsatisfactory.

(17)$_7$ — 20-12-95

About 2 months ~~before office~~ before Basavaya's complaint the ryots of the village submitted the following petition to the Amildar — That bhamaveeraya was a poor man

and owned no lands in the village. That for cutting down Jali trees unauthorizedly he was fined Rs 10/- That the village was a big one & contained many substantial & ryots. Therefore that a ~~competent~~ competent man in whom they could confide might be appointed Patel in place of Bhanna Veerayya.

× Vide – Sub-division Officer's Memo of 31-3-95 – enclosure to paper no 10. English. Correspondence

These allegations are corroborated

The Amildar thereon reported to the Sub-division officer as follows —

Vide – (18)7 Amildar's report no 149 of 27-3-96

Vide – Also English correspondence paper no 11.

That in accordance with Govt. Order no 22170/1738 of 26-5-95 & the Dy. Comr's Order no 4372 of 10-6-95 Bhannaveeraya was appointed gumasta on probation for a year on the responsibility of Patel Basavaya. That on the complaint of one Seshappa, that Basavaya and Bhannaveeraya acted high-handedly in the matter of cattle-pound, enquiry was made by him. That the accounts & the receipts of the cattle-pound seemed to have been tampered with. That by referring to the cattle-pound register, it was found that those cattle

which were mentioned in the petn of Basavayya as impounded in the month of September were not all entered in the accounts register of that month. That on 24-10-95, 17 cattle at one time and 12 at another time seemed to have been impounded according to the register. That the accounts & fines of 12 cattle of the first-lot were not kept and remitted respectively by Bhaumaveeraya. That it also appeared from the register that Bhaumaveeraya had misappropriated a certain amount of the collection of fines. That besides Basavayya submitted two reports of 24-12-95 and 20-2-96 respectively complaining against the unsatisfactory conduct of Bhaumaveeraya. And that by the local enquiry Bhaumaveeraya did not appear to be the grandson of Basavayya.

(19) - 29-6-96

About three months after the above report was submitted, there appeared the resignation from Basavayya, of his office in favour of

bhanaveeraya. But 20-7-96—(21)
Basavayya denied the
submission of any such resignation
~~of his office by him~~ &
stated that bhanna-
veerayya had played
some trick to make
himself Patel.

Basavayya complained 8-7-96—(24)
to the Amildar that he
was wrong in passing
favourable orders on
the forged petition of
bhanaveeraya who
was ordered by the
Sub division officer
to be criminally prosecuted
for misappropriating
Rs 3-4-0 of the pound
collections.

Vide— 25, 26, 27 & 28

Basavayya sub-
mitted ~~petitions~~ 4 petitions
to the Sub-division Officer
complaining that, by influence of bribery false
records were fabricated
in the Taluk Office, stating
that he resigned his office
Patelki & that an enquiry
might be made concerning
false records. Basavayya 26-7-96—(1)
again complained to the
Amildar that bhanna-
veeraya absented himself
from the village for
5 or 6 days with the Key of
the cattle-pound, on account of

and unworthy of the appointment. That report no 169 of 27-3-96 was submitted by his predecessor to the same effect. That Basavaya would strongly oppose to the retention of and continuance of Bhaima-veeraya ~~in the office~~ as gumasta. That Bhaima-veeraya purchased one of the impounded cattle in the public sale & as a consequence was convicted. Therefore that Bhaimaveeraya was not fit for the office of Patéli & somebody somebody else might be appointed.

The Amildar again reported that Bhaimaveeraya might be removed from the office & Sreenivasaya might be appointed in the former's place.

Vide Amildar's report no 270 of 23-12-96 (36)7.

The Sub-division-Officer objected to the above proposal on the ground that Sreenivasaya was a relative of Thambiog & ordered that somebody else might be ~~elected~~ selected for gumastas' place,

Vide — Sub-division Officer's orders no 2318 of 29-12-96 (38)7

12 at one time and 17 at another time. That he had shown the accounts of only 5 of the second lot & did not show the accounts of the remaining 12. That this fact showed that he misappropriated fines of 12 cattle.

That there are two petitions submitted by Basavaya, to the effect that the conduct of Bhanna veeraya was not satisfactory. That the petitions are dated 24-12-95 and 20-2-96 respectively.

That in a case no 169 of 1896-97 Bhanna veeraya was convicted for purchasing a cattle ~~quadruped~~ which was impounded & which was publicly sold. That the conviction was confirmed by the appellate authority.

That the bunds of the village are not in proper order. Though Bhanna veeraya was ordered several times to repair ~~rectify~~ them.

That the tanks & other water-sources of this village are not in proper condition.

That Bhanna veeraya did

not take pains to keep them in good order.

That it is also ascertained* that the police duties are not well performed by him.

That Bhaumaveeraya possesses no lands in the village. & That he is also unpopular in the village on account of his partizanship & interference in things which do not belong to his sphere.

Vide (65½)*

Vide- Sub-Division Officer's memo of 31-3-93 enclosure to Paper No.10 English Correspondence.

Thereon the Sub-division officer called for the records connected with the office of Patel.

About this time 2-1-97

Bhaumaveeraya submitted the following petition to the Sub-division officer—

That he was appointed Gumasta by Govt. sanction. That by the misrepresentation of the Amildar who was prejudiced against him he was declared unfit for the gumasta's place. That he has documents+ written by the Patel who has stated in them that he would resign the office in his favour. That in fact he has resigned the office in his favour. & That he is the grandson of the Patel

Vide- enclosures to (66)7*

10. 31

and as such is entitled to the place of Patel.

The Sub division officer called for records again.

Meanwhile the Amildar in accordance with the Sub division officer's order no 200 dt 3-12-96 selected Sreenivasaya for gumastas place & recommended the removal of Bhaama-veeraya on the ground that the ~~work might~~ duties of the Patel office might be conducted properly.

Vide—(34)7

Vide - Amildar's Report-no 436 dt 15-1-97

Sreenivasaya was appointed gumasta temporarily for 6 months by order no 80 dt 7-8-97 & Bhaama-veeraya was removed, on account of his unsatisfactory conduct.

Vide—(47)7

(52/7)

Patel Bhaama-veeraya appealed against the above order of the Sub division officer to the Dy. Comr on the following grounds —

That the petitioner is not aware of the ~~the~~ so called misconduct

stated in the Sub-Division
officer's order.

2 That the previous holder
of the office is the maternal
grandfather of the petitioner
& the petitioner is his heir
and legal representative
as his maternal grand-father
had no male issues.

3 That he succeeded
to the office at the re-
quest of his grandfather.

4 That ~~the petitioner~~
~~submits~~ ~~that~~ the hereditary
office cannot be taken
away from the family
for the simple ~~one~~ mis-
conduct & given to a
Brahmin who has
no right whatever.

5. That Sreenivasaya
is the son of the Bhan-
bhogue and as such
cannot hold the
office of Patell while
his undivided father
holds the office of
Bhanbhogi.

And he requested on
the above grounds that
the Sub Division officer's
order based on the
recommendation of
the Amildar might be canc

5/

33/ The Dy. Comr. by referring to the records ordered as follows—

That for the reasons ~~sub stated~~ stated in the memorandum of the Amildar, and in accordance with the deposition of the Nagdar Patel to the effect that other than Bhanna-veeraya should be appointed permanently, Sreenivasa has been appointed permanently & Bhannaveeraya has been removed from his office, by the Sub division officer. Therefore the order of the Subdivision Officer seems to be correct.

Vide Dy Comrs order to 2779 27-10-97

Bhannaveeraya has brought an appeal against the above order of the Dy. Comr. on the following grounds—

1 That the decision of the Dy. Comr. is opposed to the facts of the case and Govt. Proceedings on the subject.

2 That the order of the Subdivision officer based on the Amildar's report to the effect that the appellant is a man

of irregular conduct, is incorrect.

3 That that part of the Dy. Comrs order giving prominence to the whim of the registered Patel is contrary to Govt. orders.

4 That the appellant is not a gramasta as held by the Dy. Comrs but a legal claimant to the office of Patel being appointed on probation. That therefore he should be considered a proper claimant to the office as the period of probation expired long ago.

5 And that the appointment of a separate Brahmin gramasta removing the one who is already in the office, without good reasons, is illegal.

The appellant prays on these grounds that the order of the Dy. Comrs may be cancelled and he may be restored to his office.

Basavaya has submitted an appeal petition in support of the above appeal petition of

35

bhaumaveeraya &
prays that bhauma-
veeraya may be re-
appointed as gumasta

hrg.
19/5/98

The question for determin in
this case is whether the
appellant was rightly
dismissed. Basanya, the mukhdar
Patel for whom the appellant
is gumasta has no locus
standi in this case & his
petition no 2474 (S no 14, pen
file) requires no order.

= The amildar states that
the appellant has been
convicted ~~by him a magistrate~~
in Case no 49 of 1896-97
of the offence of having
bought in a sale held
by him as patel. & that
the conviction has been
confirmed. The records of
this case have not been
sent up but do not seem
to be absolutely necessary.

= In his report dt 9/5/98, the
Dy commr refers to

"misappropriations of cattle-pound collections" by the appellant without the necessary details.

The records as summarised in the precis show that some enquiry was held by the amildar but that this led to nothing

In my humble opinion, the appellant ought to have been criminally prosecuted as a warning to others. There is a tendency in the local revenue officers to treat defalcations of Govt money as an ordinary occurrence.

In his appeal petition to Govt, the appellant nowhere refers to or explains his connection in the case referred to & the charges of misappropriation preferred against him

He raises side issues viz that his successor is a Brahmin, that the huk dar Patel is willing that he should appeal, & so forth to allow him to appeal,

The appellant also contends that, as he is the grandson of the registered Patel who has no nearer relation, he is himself a hukdar & not a gumasta
This question does not arise in this case.

The appeal, in so far as it relates to the removal of a village officer for misconduct does not come within the purview of clause (a) of Sec^{n} 221 of the L R code. It is therefore not a "Communication"

26/5/98

In reply to an enquiry as to the cases in which Chennaveeraya, the patel Gumaster, misappropriated Cattle-pound receipts, the Deputy Comm^{r}

Deputy Comm^{r} No D 540 of 21st Nov 1898.

Reports that in addition to the very suspicious entries on the 4th October 1895 and 26th January 1896 in the Pound register, it was found that he misappropriated Rs 2-10-- levied on the 24th October 1895 on 12 head of Cattle, and that the then Local Officers ~~Hon~~ probably thought it inadvisable to take measures against Chennaveeriya on the Criminal side, as Harohalli is a notorious place with factious people ready to fabricate evidence &c

Mly 28/11/98

Hy 30/11/98

1022

The [illegible] of the [illegible] in the alleged [illegible] of the cattle [illegible] collection – The [illegible] and [illegible] not [illegible] by Court [illegible] of [illegible] cannot be accepted – If there is [illegible] legally admissible [illegible] the case might be tried summarily [illegible] result [illegible] found [illegible] Surname

In the [illegible] Court
[illegible] Court
to the [illegible]

Hy 2/12/98

Mly 3/12/98

The Dt Magte has now forwarded the records of the criminal case in the original & appellate courts. These show that the offence is a technical one ~~that~~ and does not evidence any wanton breach of law on the petr's part.

7/1/99.

Rec'd
430
2nd
40

LR 71-90-2

43

(General Serial No. 32.)

189 .

(2)

This appeal is within time.

Petition sufficiently stamped.

Copy of order produced.

Para 1 Rule 1 of Appl. Rules complied with by the Council.

11/7/91 AA

No. 430

Name of Petitioner. B. Atavaiah

Village. Hanchelli

Taluk. Bangalore

District. Bangalore.

Date of Arzi. 1st " June 91

Date of Receipt. 2nd " June 91

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Three

Caveat Port. 5-19-91

ABSTRACT.

I The petitioner the Patel of Hanchelli begs leave to state that he owns Government Kandaya included with an Inam of Rs 80. of said 176-12-41 fell into arrears for the recovery of which the Government authorities alienated his hereditary Patelki in favour of one Anaday Obaiah.

II A few days after the Service of a notice demanding the Payment of the said arrears he made his own arrangements and produced the money before the Amildar who refused to receive it. After an application the Deputy Commr ordered the Amildar to send him a report on the case, after receiving which the Deputy

Deputy Commr without any enquiry has, by an order dated 4th March 1891, decided the case against him.

II The petitioner therefore appeals to this Office on the grounds that

(1) For the recovery of the arrears the hereditary Patelship ought not to have been alienated; the land ought to have been first sold and on failure of the realization of the full amount thereby, the remainder ought either to have been remitted or to have been recovered by the sale of some other property;

(2) the present incumbent has no claims to the Patelship Akalaq Obalgiah other than that he has paid towards the discharge of the said arrears;

(3) The petitioner has got grown sons, brothers whose claims to the Patelship have been lately overlooked; and prays that his case may be enquired into, and his claims to the Patelship may be established.

45

No. 94. R

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

Revenue 3 1/9/91

LR 71-9 r 3

The accompanying Petition No. 430
dated 1st June 91, received at the
Dewan's Office from Basaviah,
Harohalli, Kankanhalli
TK

is forwarded, together with its three
enclosures, to the Deputy Comr,
Bangalore Dist for
submission of proceedings
with a precis thereof

By Order,

for Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
5th Sept 189 1.

Drafted as per
Councellor's order

47

LR 71-90-4

(General Serial No. 30.)

1891

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE 12 DEC. 91 P.M. 8615

From The Dy. Commissioner Bangalore Dt. (4)

To The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated 5th December/91.

Despatched

Received Camp Doddaballapur.

Enclosures No. 8 files

General No.

D No. 715

Sir, With reference to the marginally noted official Memoranda of the Petition Department, I have the honor to submit the entire Proceedings Connected with the Cases referred to, respectively. Undersigned regrets that owing to paucity of hands in the District office the

Official Memo: No: 92 dated 10th September/91.

✓	Do	94	5th Do
✓	Do	111	28th Do
✓	Do	112	29th Do
✓	Do	137	7th Nov/91.
✓	Do	102	29th Sept/91
✓	Do 136	104	Do
	Do	103	Do

Ans 12-12-91

Precis called for
could not be pre-
pared.

M Mukherjee
Dy Commissioner

LR 71-90-5 49

No. 32 791-92

Abballan &
Basaviah, Patail of Naroballi
Kankanhalli Taluk, Bangalore
Dist. represented by Mr. Advocate
S. Narasimmiengar

Endorsement.

(6)
Respondent

Vale oblayya
represented by
Mr. B. V. Rama-
swamy Chetty
advocate.

In reply to his Petition dated [illegible] Appellant is referred to the Deputy Commr. who has been requested to restore him to office, if he, within 6 months from this date, pays up the arrears ~~is informed that~~ recovered from Respondent with interest at 12 per cent per annum and acquires lands, assessed at 5 Rs, in the village of

2. The Encs: are returned

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
30 June 1892.

By Order,
Draft-
Chief Secretary.

Mysore Government Central Press Bangalore.—28-9-91—1000.

Issued with enclosures
30/6.

57

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892.

(7)

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Dy. Comm^r,
Bangalore Distt.

LR 71-90-6

Dated 27th }
Despatched 30th } June 1892.

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 5740 R.
No. P. 98

Directing the restoration of Appellant Basavaiah to the Patail of Harohalli, Kankanhalli Taluk, if he should fulfil his conditions within the time promised.

References to be marked.

L.R. 71-92 Re. Draft for approval

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

(7)

Appeal No. 32 of 1891-92

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Basaviah Patil of Harohalli, Kankanhalli Taluk, Bangalore District, represented by Mr. Advocate S. Narasimmiengar		Urle Oblayya represented by Mr. B. V. Ramaswamy Chetty, Advocate

Decision. 24-6-92

Petitioner was removed from office in March 1891, because he fell in to arrears, lost all lands, and became a pauper, and the appointment was conferred on Respondent – a stranger, from whom the arrears were collected.

2. At the hearing, the Appellant stated that his nephews, brother and daughter's son have no lands in the village, but promises to pay the arrears due, and also interest at 12 per cent per annum to the man newly appointed on the sum paid by him, and acquire lands assessed at 50 Rs within 6 months from this date. If he fulfils

52

these conditions within the time promised, the Deputy Commissioner is requested to restore him to the office.

25/6/92

By order.

Draft

Chief Secretary

R.

No 5740 dated 30/6/92
pet No. 98

Copy forwarded to the Deputy Comm^r, Bangalore Dist^t with the papers received with his No. 715 of 5 Dec^r/91.

'By order'

Chief Secretary

5 3

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894

OFFICE
95-2392
23 AUG 94
Pet: 135

From The Dy Commissioner Bangalore District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore. (8)

Dated 20th August 94

Despatched 21st

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file

General No.
D No. 235

In reply to his letter No 5740 Pet 98 of 30-6-94

SUBJECT.

Reporting that Boraiah is unfit to hold the office of Patel of Nerolalli, Kankanalli Taluk, Bangalore District.

Petition Branch 24/8

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Submitted to Council 27/8

[redacted]

17/10

D No 235
Note To,

57. My Commissioner's Office,
Bangalore, 20th August 1894

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

(8)

Sir,

With reference to your memo:
No. 5740
Rep. 98 dated the 30th June 1892,
forwarding copy of Government decision in Appeal No. 32 of 1891-92, directing the restoration of Basaviah to the office of Patel of Narohalli, Kankanhalli Taluk, provided he paid up the arrears due, and acquired lands assessed at Rs. 50 within six months, I have the honor to state that Basaviah has complied with the conditions though he did not do it within the time allowed, and the Sub Division officer has called upon him to find a competent heir or Sunnasta, as he is illiterate and superannuated.

2. Obliah, who has been now officiating as Patel has appealed against the aforesaid order.

3. The Government seem to have

passed the decision alluded to, under the impression as the Sub Division officer also appears to be, that Basavaiah is a Hakdar Patel. He is not a hereditary Patel. He was appointed in place of Gurusiddiah who resigned the office in his favor in 1877. The Sub Division officer considers him to be unfit and I agree with him. I have seen the man. He is too old and infirm and is besides illiterate. I do not think he deserves to be restored.

4. Under these circumstances I solicit that the Government will be pleased to reconsider their Order of 1892.

5. The entire record of the case is herein enclosed.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant,

For Dy Commissioner

(9)

LR 71-90-9

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

No. 6553/Pat 546 Dt. 24-10-94/26.

His letter no 236 dated 20th August 94 reporting that Basaviah ~~is unfit to hold the office of~~ Patel of Harohalli Kankanhalli Taluk is unfit & has left the office

---

In reply has the honour to request that he will be so good as to ~~report~~ report at once whether Petitioner, Basaviah has nominated a competent Gumasta to perform the duties -

By order

Council order Dasp. 17-10-94

24/10/94
for Chief Secretary

23/10

23/10

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

No.

Pet k 4 57
9-4-91

Read.
10/4

Subd to the Rev. Councillor, with reference to the Council Decision, paper (7), and the Senior Councillor's order on the Dr Com'r reference dd 2nd Augt 1894, paper (8).

The question for order is - Whether the decision of June 1892 directing the restoration of Basava is open to reconsideration or should effect be given to.

OR
23/5

The decision referred to was passed in 1892 directing the restoration of Basava on certain conditions which he has since fulfilled. Admittedly he did his work from 1877 to 1891 and his disqualification that he was illiterate did not apparently cause inconvenience to the performance by him during that period. His duties. His exact age has not been stated but is said to be superannuated. The Dy Com'r could have taught

LR 71-90-10

Gen. Serial No. 31.]

1894. 5 / 3354.

10 APR 95

Pet 543

From

The Dy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

(10)

To

Chief
The Secretary to the Govt
~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Dated 8th April 1895.
Despatched 9th Do
Received

Enclosures.—No. 7.

General No.
No. 1203.

His No. 65-5-3 Pet. 546 dated 24th October last, enquiring if Basavaiah, Patel of Harohally, Kankanhalli Taluk, has appointed a competent Gumasta to perform the duties.

Has the honor to state that Basavaiah has appointed his daughter's son Chennaiah as Gumasta and that the latter has been doing duty as per orders of the

Sub Division officer
No. 34 dated 7th March
1894 ...

2. The Sub Division
Officer's No. 446 of the
24th January last
with its
enclosures, is herewith
submitted.

3. On further enquiry,
it is learnt that Cheri-
veriah does not own
lands of his own and
lives at Karohalli. The
Sub Division Officer's
letter No. 836 dated
31st. Ultimo, is en-
closed. ...

... /

Asst. Commissioner
Mr. Boy

dispute
Has matter been settled &
obtained the finality
orders upon the called
upon Basavayya to
do all that was required
of him by the decision of
1892. It is not quite
fair to debar him
this appeal after he
has complied with all
the conditions imposed
upon him and even
appointed a substitute
who is 24 yrs old
and is his daughter's
son - under
the village ... guardian
ship - It is a fair
thing for us to give
him the appeal or
to ask Basavayya to
separate who does
his work on his
responsibility? If
Basavayya ! If
after one year the
Dept. comes still
but the enquiry
of repeated upon
the matter before
he may do so.
Passed in the meanwhile
it does not seem
to 26.5.95 necessary to
- consider the
order of Govt
already

Petr. Br. Mrk 27.5.95.

(11) P 59

Read:-

LR 71-90-11

Letr No 235 dated 20th August 1894 from Deputy Commr, Bangalore, reporting that Basaviah, Patel of Harshalli, Rankanhalli Taluk, ~~is unfit to hold the office~~ has complied with the conditions referred to in the decision of Govt in Appeal No 32 of 1891-92 dated 4 June 1892, but that he is not a hereditary Patel and is old & infirm, and requesting reconsideration of the said decision

Docket No 1203 dated 8th April 1895 from the same office in reply to Endorsement No 6553 dated 24-10-94. stating that Basavaiah has appointed his daughter's son Chennigiah as Jamaeta to perform the duties of the office

Order No 22170 Pet: 1738 dated 26.5.95. Mb.

The decision of Govt passed in 1892 directed the restoration of Basaviah on certain conditions which he has since fulfilled. Admittedly he did work from 1877 to 1891 and the disqualification that he was illiterate did not apparently cause inconvenience to the performance by him of his duties

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.

No.

duties during that period. That ground cannot have much force now. His exact age has not been stated but he is said to be superannuated. The Dy. Comm^r could have brought this objection to notice and obtained the requisite orders before he called upon Basaviah to do all that was required of him by the decision of 1892. It is not quite fair to deprive him of his appointment after he has conformed to all the conditions imposed upon him and even appointed a substitute who is 24 years old and is his daughter's son.

Under these circumstances a fair trial should be given to the acting Patel or Jumasta who does his work on the responsibility of Basavaiya.

Sd

If after one year the Deputy Commr will still feel the necessity of reporting upon the matter to Govt, he may do so. In the meanwhile it does not seem necessary to reconsider the order of Govt already passed.

Draft.
(R.C's order)

JMM 30/5/95
Under
~~Off Chief Secy.~~

To BB 29/5

The Dy Commissioner,
Bangalore District,
with record

JM
29/5

L R 71-90-12 (12) 62

1898

No. 2014

Name of Petitioner Cheenaveeraiya

Village Harohally

Taluk Kankanhally

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 7-2-98

Date of Receipt 8-2-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one

S. Ld

(1) 2 Rs. Stamp affixed
: Stamps in file

(2) Order appealed against
dt. 27. 10. 97
12 days in preparing copy

My 10/3/98 In time

(3) Appeal against Dy Com's order directing the petr's removal from the post of patel
grounds as the Huzkur is willing to do the duties himself
for the reasons"

(4) Petr claims to be a hukdar himself

Not a Coml Case

Hd Q 1st Coml Asst

21/2/98

Calls for a report
regarding the alleged
Patel's misconduct
in general & also
under wh the charge
under wh he is deemed
to be guilty specified
Meanwhile to
the complainant &
a manager that if deemed
until the report is rec'd
will maintain
Status quo.

16.3.98

17/3/98

ABSTRACT Bang:

Translation of Dy Comm's
Yadi no: 227 of 7-10-97-
Heard appellant Cheenaveera
advocate Mr. Venkataramanaya
& Pleader Mr. Venkatramanaya
" For the reasons stated
in the Amildar's memo form-
-ing a part of the record, the
removal of appellant Chenna
-veeraiya from office, is
ordered - Besides Basavaiya
the registered Potail represents
that the Guniasta is unnecess
-ary & that he would conduct

the business himself. He has further deposed that in the event of his inability to discharge the duties of a potail, he would appoint a separate gumasta. For the foregoing reasons the removal of the appellant Chenna Veeraiya from office who was temporarily appointed on probation, seems reasonable."

"The above order is made known to the advocates:-

The present appeal is against the above order on the following grounds:

(1) that the decision of the Dy.Commr: is opposed to the facts of the case & Govt: Pro: on the Subject.

(2) that the order of the Sub-Div: Officer on the misrepresentation of the Asst: that the appellant is a man of immoral conduct, is incorrect.

(3) that that part of the Dy.Commr's decision touching upon the whims of the registered office holder is contrary to Govt: orders

(4) That the appellant is not a gumasta as held by the Dy.Commr. but a legal claimant to office who was appointed to that post on probation & that he should be considered as pukka claimant for the office as the period of Probation ~~&~~ Expired long ago -

(5-) That the appointment of a Separate Brahman gumasta, removing the one in office without good reasons, is illegal -

For the foregoing reasons prays that the Dy.Commrs orders may be set-aside and the appellant restored to this office

9/2/98

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD. NO. 2014R
DATE 8-2-98.

67

Pet 1197.

P2

22-3-98

(13)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

(271-90-13)

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition Registered No. 2014 dated 4-2-98 received at the Dewan's Office from Cheuna Veeraiya of Harohally in the Kankanhally Taluk, appealing against the order of the 17 Laee directing the petr's removal from the Patelli Quinquotta of the above village,

is forwarded, together with its one enclosure, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore District for a full report of the facts of the case and on the points urged in the petition.

3 The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

2. Court further observe that the registered Patel should not be permitted to undertake the charge unless he is deemed perfectly qualified. This is with reference to the conditional sanction of deemed unfit the registered official will

By order,

Chief Secretary.

22/3/98 189

22/3/98

By order

Secretary

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-96—1,000

Secretary

(17/2/98)

Mfl
7.4.98

L R 271-98 14 (14) 1898

68

No. 2474

Name of Petitioner Basavayya Patel of

Village Harohalli

Taluk Kanakanahalli

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 2-4-98

Date of Receipt 4-4-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure —

Ver: Records for refers.

HWK
9/4/98

[illegible] 1-6-91 [illegible] 4307
[illegible]
[illegible] 12-91 [illegible] 3715
[illegible]
[illegible]

14 4 98

P. 7. 15-92 Containing
the above Number put up

14/4/98

14/4/98

Rec'd 15/4/98 G.J. Records.

The file now put up is unconnected
please put up the correct refers.

HWK.
15/4/98

Connected papers are [illegible]

16/4/98
Rec'd 18/4/98

Submitted with refers

21/4/98

Has there been any
appeal from Bhanuveerayya?

23/4/98

2014 of 97 Memo No. 11970 of 22/3/98.

HWK
23/4/98 The above refs are put up

ABSTRACT

Petitioner states as follows — That — in accordance with Govt. Proceedings no 3 — of 1891-92 his heir Bhanu Veerayya was appointed Patel of the above village That of late somebody else was appointed as gumasta in place of Bhanuveerayya by order of the Subdivision Officer & the petitioner is not allowed to draw his salary. That — his heir at first appealed to the Dy. [illegible]

and then to the Govt. against 69
the order of the Dy. Comrs.
That the petitioner has
given his consent to the
appeal made by his
heir. That during the
disposal of the case
he desires to be before
the Govt. And he
prays that the present
guinastha may be Re-
moved & that Bhanna-
veerayya may be appointed
Patel permanently.

MS
5/4/88

2474

Recd
To Petition
4/4/94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
RECD. ON 2474

2 Rs stamp affixed

7.

1/ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 12/4/98 [illegible]

12

Pet 1840 f2 (15) 2-5-98

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying ~~Appeal~~ Petition Registered No. 2474 dated 2-4-98 received at the Dewan's Office from Basavaiya Patel of Harohally in the Kankanhalli Taluk, ~~the complaining of~~ the order of the Collector in appealing against the decision of the Patel of Harohally in preference to his brother Channaveeraiya from the Batch gumashtaship is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosure~~, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore District in continuation of this office No. Pet 1197 dated 22-3-98.

2. The pala should be returned

By order,

for Secretary.

BANGALORE,
30-4-1898

2-5

28/4/98

23-5-98 ... 71-90-46 1340

6-5-98 73 8 Days

Rep. put up

11/5/98

Subd

MG 9/5/98

Recn of papers bearing on Chenna Venkat's regulations & his dismissal

Entry MG 10/5/98

Mr Venkannaben. 10/5/98.

Previous subd MG 9/5/98

MG 20/5/98 Subd & Rev Consultor Easter Dy with Recn

MG 26/5/98

MAY 4 1898 SECRETARIAT'S OFFICE

From

The Dy. Commissioner, of the Bangalore District.

To The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore Genl & Rev Departments.

Dated 30th April 1898

Despatched 3rd May 1898.

Received

General No.

D No. 1449

Enclosure No. 1 file

Encl. to D.O. No. 1197 dt 2nd May 1898.

Report on [illegible] complaints of Harohalli Kankanhally Hobli regarding his removal from the office of Police Patel of the said village.

Petn

4.5.98

D. N° 1449
Encl 1 file

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore ..... April 1898.

To,

The Secretary
to the Government of Mysore
Revenue and General Depts.

Sir,

With reference to your official memo Rev 1197 dated 22nd March 898 forwarding for report, a petition on Thimmaveeria of Harohalli in the Kankanhalli Taluk, regarding his removal from the office of Patel Gumasta of the above village, I have the honor to state as follows.-

2- One Basaviah, the maternal grandfather of the petitioner is the registered patel of the Harohalli village of the Kankanhalli Taluk. In the year

1891-92, on account of certain irre=
=gularities regarding the cattle pound
receipts, Basaviah was dismissed
from the office of patel and one
Obliah was nominated in his
stead by the then Sub Division Officer of Closepet.
But subsequently, Government in
appeal case 32 of 1891-92 ordered
Basaviah to be reinstated as patel,
on condition that he paid up the
arrears due from him with interest,
and acquired lands in the village assessed
at 50 Rs. In accordance with the
above order, Basaviah paid up the
money, and, as he was illiterate and
too old to discharge the duties of
his office, he nominated the present
petitioner, Chenna Veeria, his daughter's
son, as his gumasta. This arrangement
worked satisfactorily till about 1895,
when, on account of an estrange=
=ment between Basaviah, and his
gumasta Chennaveeria, the duties

of the patel's office were not properly performed, and complaints on the subject were made by several ryots, notably regarding the mismanage= =ment of the cattle pound and the misappropriation of the receipts thereof. It was also complained that the conduct of Chennaveeria was very improper in many respects and that he was a person quite unfit for a patel. Basaviah also stated that his gumasta's conduct was very improper and prayed that Chennaveeria might be removed from the office and he permitted to nominate another gumasta in his place

3- On investigation, it was found that in certain cases, Chenna= =veeria had misappropriated the cattle pound receipts to the extent of about 3 Rs. and that on the occasion

Why not prosecuted?

of the sale of certain unclaimed impounded cattle, he bought the animals for himself. It was also found that the other duties of his office were also neglected. All these charges are stated in detail in a memo by the Amildar dated 24th December 1896 enclosed in the file. For these reasons, under the orders of the Sub Division Officer & Collector, the patel ganasta Chennaveera was removed from his office and one Srinivasayya, the nominee of Basavaiah, appointed instead. On Chennaveera's appeal to this office, the above order of the Sub Division Officer was confirmed on 27th October 1897. Against this order, the petitioner has now appealed to Government.

4- With reference to para 2 of the official memo under reply, I beg to state that the registered patel, Basavaiah, is old and illiterate and so he has not been allowed to

undertake the charge himself; but has been permitted to nominate a competent gumasta to discharge the duties of the office.

5- The records of the case and the petition under report are herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

M Venkatarangiya

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

vms/

79

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Ol. No. 8167
MAY 6 1898
No 878 189 -98
SECRETARIAT OFFICE

(17)

From

The Dy. Commissioner, of the
Bangalore District.

To The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore
Genl & Rev Departments

SR. 71-90-17

Dated 6th } May 1898
Despatched 7th }
Received

General No.
No. 1483

Enclosure No. 1

Govt Office Memo No.
Pub 1340 dy 20th April 1898

Reports regarding the petition from Basavaiya Patel of Harohalli, Kan=kanhalli Taluk regarding the appointment of his heir Chenna Veeria to the Potali of Harohalli.

Petition Marked
9-5-98

To/5.

80

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 6th May 1898.

D No. 1483.
Ex-nil
To,

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Revenue and Jeneral
Departments

Sir,

In returning herewith the petition of Basaviah, Patel of Harohalli in the Kankanhalli Taluk, received with your official Memo No Ret 1340 dated the 30th April 1898 I have the honor to state that the subject matter there of is the same as has been reported on in this office No 1449 dated the 30th April 1898. It will be seen from it that the said Basaviah, the

registered patel of the Haro-
halli village, was once
desirous that Chenna Veeriah,
his daughter's son, and his
heir should, on account of
his improper conduct and
unfitness for the office, be
removed from the office of
patel gumasta and that
he (Basaviah) should be
allowed to choose another
in his stead. In the present
petition, however, he states
that he has now been re-
conciled with his grandson,
Chenna Veeriah, and that
the latter is his only heir
and kaldar to the patel's
office, that he is very old
and infirm and that therefore

he wishes that Chikkana Veerish
should be confirmed, as
patel gumasta. But he was
dismissed for having mis-
appropriated Government
money -

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

Refer
7/8/98

83

(14)

1898

No. 2876

Name of Petitioner Channaveeriah Patel

Village Harohalli

Taluk Kankanhalli

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 28/5/98.

Date of Receipt 28/5/98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure nil.

ABSTRACT

Reminder to his appeal no 2014 of 7-2-98 in connection with his right to the patelli of Harohalli being overlooked.

Prays that all the records connected with this matter may be perused together with his agreement of the Register-dar &c and orders granted for the duties of the patel being discharged by him.

BL
2/6/98

14 of 6 Sub No 20-1197-22-3-98

Vide petn no 2877
6 98

LR 71-90-18

8L

2876

To Patwari
KL
28/5/98

Eight annas stamp affixed

REGD. NO. 2876

DATE 28-5-98

Acpee LR 71-90-19 Pet-609 & 666 857

3/6/98

1898

2474 Secy - 1340 - 2 - 4 - 98

Gl. No 8018/609 from DC Bangalore letter No: 14469 dt 30-4-98 enclosing reports was submitted to the Rev: Commissioner Co. D. on 26-5-98.

AK 6/6/98

Submitted with pet No 2876

MLJ 7/6/98

Subd in Cabt No 5

Rev Cr Subd

7/6/98

No. 2877

Name of Petitioner Patel Basavia

Village Harohalli

Taluk Kankanhalli

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 28-5-98

Date of Receipt 28-5-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 2

ABSTRACT

Reminder to his petition No. 247[illegible] of 2-4-98 in re the Patels of Harohal[illegible]

Acknowledges receipt of Endorsement No. 2474 of 28-4-98. Encloses Endorsement No. 2570 of 16-5-98 issued by the Amildar of Kankanhalli on his petition in pursuance of the Dy. Comrs order No. 1145 3/4 on his petition to the Effect that no action could be done about the Patels reference till the records are returned from [illegible] and prays that the office may be kept in Cheluvaraya's name by taking steps and his for agreement on the file of the Revenue petition of No. 2011 of 2-2-98.

HC. 2/6/98

COURT FEE

Eight annas stamp affixed

DEWANI OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD. NO. 2877

87

ನಂಬರ್. 2474

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
ಹುಜೂರ್ ದಿವಾನ್ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ.
MAY 96

ಅರ್ಜೀದಾರ [illegible] ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು [illegible]

ಇರುವ [illegible] ಗೆ ಇಂಡಾರಸ್ ಹುಕ್ಕುಂ.

ನೀನು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿದ 2 — 4 — 95 —— ನೇ ಮುಕ್ತುಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಯನ್ನು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟು ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮ್ಮಿಷನರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು 28 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ [illegible] ಸನ್ 189 8 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ದರ್ಖಾಗಾ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order,

[signature]
for Chief Secretary.

Mysore Government Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-92.—2,000.

[illegible]

Rejd
23/7/98

LR 71-90-20

8981-616. Rev. ex 26/5

1898 (20)

No. 190

Name of Petitioner Chennaveerush,

Village Harohalli

Taluk Kankankalli

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 20-7-98

Date of Receipt 20-7-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

2074 of 97 Memo No 1340 of 30/4/98.

Rejd
23/7/98 Refs were put up for Sl. Nos 8018/609 of 30-4-98. 8157/616 of 26.5.98. and Subs to the Rev. Commissioner Eastern Dn on 26.5.98

Rejd
25/7/98. Submitted

Mily
26/7/98

24/7/98

ABSTRACT

Reminder to his petition dated 7-8-98 ? ? No. 2014, Regd the Patelii of Harohalli.

He prays that he may be permitted to look after the Patelii.

Rejd
22/7/98.

MYSORE DISTRICT OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. AS
DATE 20-7-98

20-7-98

Rejd 271-98
27.7.98

91

1898

No. 207

Name of Petitioner Basavaraja of

Village Harohalli

Taluk Kankanahalli

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 20-7-98

Date of Receipt 22-7-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure nil

130 of 98 Sent to Revenue Commissioner Bng on 26-7-98.

MJR 28/7/98

Sent to the Asst Commr & Tahsildar Kankanahalli for Enquiry & Report

Sd/- Rev. Commr 8/8/98

MJR 8/8/98

In Tahsildar 4/10/98

Sd/- Asst Commr 2/9/98

76

Before passing orders on this appeal No. 2074 Inspector Kankanahalli will please Report in detail in what cases & on what grounds and to what extent Channaveeraiah's cattle were Pounded, Collection, and why he was not criminally prosecuted for such encroachments

Sd/- 2/9/98

Seen MJS 9/9/98

Drafted 6/9/98

ABSTRACT

Reminder to the Petition Dated 2.4.98 & 28.5.98 praying that the Patel of the above village may be registered in the name of his daughters son Channa Veeraiya.

Bkm 26/7.

REGD. NO. 207/R
DATE 22-7-98

93

Proceedings of the South
of Mysore

LR 71-90-27

Read

Petn no 2014 dated
7.2.98, of Channaveeriah
of Harohally in the Kasaba
-Kanahally Hli, appealing
against the order of the
Dy Comr Bangalore Dt
directing the Petnr's removal
from the Patelai gumastha
-ship of the Harohally village

(2) the letter no 1449 dated 30th
April 1898, from the Dy
Comr, Bangalore Dt,
reporting with reference
to the above, that the Petnr
was removed from
service for mis appropri
-ation of the cattle pound
receipts and other irre
-gularities

order thereon No 1885—
P.713-98 dt 8/9/98

Before passing
orders on this appeal

~~Govt desire to have~~ The Dy Comm to report in detail

~~a full information~~

~~as to~~ in what cases and

on what dates and to

what extent Channaveeriah

~~his~~ misappropriated Cattle

pound receipts. The Dy

Comm will ~~report fully~~

~~on the above and~~ also state

~~why~~ whether Patel was not

criminally prosecuted

for such criminal mis-

appropriation

per Secretary

To. The Dy Comm Bangalore

Dt with records.

+ 98-3-Sec B dl

8-9-98

95

(23)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
OFFICE No. 3351
NOV. 24 98
No. Pet. 713-98
DEWAN'S OFFICE

From The Dy. Commissioner, of the Bangalore District.

To The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore Genl. & Rev. Departments.

Dated 21st November 1898.
Despatched 22nd
Received

General No.
No. 540

Enclosure No. 1 file

Govt. order No. 1885-
Pet. 713-98
of the 9th September 1898

Submits further particulars regarding the removal of Chennarayappa from the Patel Gumasteship of the Hurdiballi village Kandikallu Talukh

Rate Rs
29.11.98

26-11-98

Pet 713 of 98 regarding the subject is put up

26/11/98

Subd 1st Committee with precedents

28/11/98

Rs 91/14/6

LR 71-98-23

9b

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore.....189

D No. 540
Sa. 1 file

To
The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore,
Genl & Rev Departments.

Sir,

With reference to Government Order No. 1885 Pet. 713-98 of the 9th September 1898, calling for further particulars regarding the removal of Chennaviraya from the Patel Gumastaship of the Harohalli village, Kankanhalli Taluk, I have the honor to state that in addition to the very suspicious entries on the 4th October 1895 and the 26th January 1896 in the Pound registers and receipts regarding the number of cattle impounded, it was found that Chennaviraya misappropriated Rs 2-10-0 levied on the 24th October 1895 on 12 heads of cattle.

2. The Officers who were then in charge of the Taluk and the Sub

Sub Division have since changed, and it is not therefore possible to state why Chennavirayya, the Patel Gumastha was not Criminally prosecuted for this Offence. It seems however that, as Harshalli is a place notorious for unscrupulous factious people ready to fabricate evidence, yea, the then local Officers thught it inadvisable to take measures on the Criminal side.

3. The vernacular records are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

Mrs

98

1 Draft

1898 (24)

From

The Secretary to Govt
Genl and Rev Depts

To

The Dt Magistrate
Bangalore Dt

LR 71-90-24

Dated 6th

Despatched 7th Dec/98

Received

General No. 4042 P

P.7 No. 13-98 (83)

Enclosure No.

Has the honor to request that he will be so good as to forward for the information of Govt, the records connected with criminal case No 49 of 96-97 on the file of the Assistant Magistrate of Kankanhally, and the records of the appeal relating to the conviction of one Channaiengar, late patel of Yagnoor Hobli of Harohally, for the offence of having ~~caught~~ purchased ~~a cattle~~ public property ~~in a~~ sale held by him.

By order

for Secretary

3-12-98.

99

2 Drafts

Read correspondence ending with letter No 540 of 21/11/98 from the D (Com) Raichur on the reporting on the appeal of Bheemavvanagouda Patil Gurnagouda & Hanchath Kamkanthi Talukh

CR 71-90-25

ready to fabricate evidence &c. (25)

order thereon Nr 4043. 6-12-98 & principal P.T.13-98

The petitioner for the removal of the gumastha (petr 2) to the alleged mis appropriation of the cattle pound collections. The excuse urged for not instituting criminal proceedings against the petr cannot be accepted. Court accordingly directs that if there is sufficient legally admissible evidence the petr may be tried criminally and pending result of such trial placed under suspension

1.12.98

for Secretary.

To. The Dy Commr Bangalore
with records and
papers

7-12-98

LR 11-90-2

Rec'd 1st Connaught

1/1/99.

10417

7/1/99

8/1/99

Docket

9/1/99

9-1-99

3869

DEC. 21.

Pet 238. 1898-99

From

The District Magistrate, of the Bangalore District.

To The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore

Dated Genl & Rev Depts 19th

Despatched 20th December 1898

Received

General No.

No. 641

Enclosure No. 2 files.

Secy's docket No. 4042 Pet. 713-98

of the 6th Instant.

Submits the records in Criminal case No. 49 of 1896-97 on the file of the Amildar Magistrate of Ramanmalli Taluk & No. 22 of 1896-97 on the file of the Closepet Sub Divisional Magistrate.

Petn N

21-12-98

Recd 2/1/99. Of 713 of 98 containing the reps to put up.

AK 4/1/99

Pet

101

Bangalore District

District Magistrate's Office

D. No. 641

Encl 2 files

Bangalore 19th December/98

To

The Secretary to the Government

of Mysore,

Genl & Rev Departments.

Sir,

As requested in your docket No. 4042 dated the 6th Instant, Pet. 7-13-98 I have the honor to submit, herewith, the records in Criminal case No. 49 of 1896-97, on the file of the Amildar Magistrate of Kankanhalli Taluk and also No. 22 of 1896-97 on the file of the Closepet Sub Division Magistrate, and to request that the files may kindly be returned when no longer required.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

C.B. Balasundaram Iyer

for District Magistrate

mks

102.

(27)

1898

From

The Secretary to Govt
in Genl & Rev Depts

To

The ~~Deputy Comr~~
District Magistrate
Bangalore Dt
(538)

Dated 11-1

Despatched 17 Jany/99.

Received 4731

General No. ~~[illegible]~~

C.Z No. 13-98

Enclosure No.

LR 71-90-27

His Letter No 64 dated 19th December 1898, submitting the records in criminal case No 49 of 26.97 on the file of the Taluk Magistrate of Kankanhalli Taluk &c.

Has the honor to return herewith the papers received with the above

ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸಿಂಗಿಲ್
-99 : ಕೇಸ್

By Order

for Secretary

9.1.99

Repa

LR 71-98-2-8

103

2-3-99

1899

No. 1466.

Name of Petitioner Patel Basappa

Village Harohalli

Taluk Kankanhalli.

District Bangalore.

Date of Arri 28-2-99.

Date of Receipt 1-3-99.

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 2.

> 8/98 Bangalore Dy Comrs Rpt 11/6/98.
> 3-6-98.

2

1899 D7 13 7 98 regarding two Patels of Harohalli in Pattanp.

13/99

Subd with repte to G O No 4043 87 13-98 30.12.98 (Refno 26)

6/3/99

To Dy Comr for Report with the obs[n] that the papers in Ghostno have been rec[d] & have with so no

6/3/99

7/3/99 Draft

6/3/99

ABSTRACT

State that he has enclosed endorsements from the Sub-Dy officer & the Dy: Comm[r] to the effect that the papers connected with his appeal about the transfer of his patels to his heir and grandson, Cheinnabirial, are in his office without any order having been passed on them; that he is an old man & is incapacitated by ill-health. Prays that his case may be decided soon during his life time.

Rpt 4998 22-11-98

2 nos. 1 Endorsement Granted

to petr. by the Dy: Commr. stating
that the records connected with
his case has been sent to the Govt. in reply to their letter
of the 3rd inst. & that they will be returned
to the Sub-Dr. after the Govt. sends
them back. No 1220/17-10-98.
Enc. 2. Endorsement by the Sub-Dr.
officer to the effect that the record
has been sent to the District, &
that he must wait for their
orders & that the records are not
with him (Sub-Dr.-Officer)
SM
2-3-99.

(225)

105.

No. Pet 713-98

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1466 dated 28-2-97 received at the Dewan's Office from Patel Basappa of Harohalli in the Kankanhalli Taluk, praying for early disposal of his petition regarding his protest to the appointment of Channaveeraiah as the Patel of Harohalli.

is forwarded, together with its enclosures to the Deputy Commr of the Bangalore Dist for disposal with the observation that the records in question of the case were returned to the Dy Commr along with Govt Order No. 4043 P.H. 13-98 dated 6th December 1898

By order,

for Secretary.

BANGALORE,
9/3/ 1899.

9/3/99